REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 14, 2006, and in response to a telephone call to the Examiner on February 16, 2007. Applicant first wishes to express gratitude to the Examiner for the telephone call on February 16, 2007, in which the Examiner indicated that the present amendments would definitely be moving this case forward.

Claims 1-31 were pending in the Application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. With this amendment, claims 1, 3-7, 12, and 19 are amended, claims 20-21 and 23-31 have been canceled, and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner maintained a rejection of claims 1-11, 19-22 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows US Patent No. 6,021,409 in view of Sarukkai et al. US Patent No. 5,819,220. On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-18 and 23-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows in view of Pringle et al. US Patent No. 6,470,306.

Of the rejected claims, claims 1, 12 and 19 are independent claims. Claim 1 is directed to a method of building a compressed speech lexicon for use in a speech application. Claim 12 is directed to a method of accessing word information related to a word stored in a compressed speech lexicon, and claim 19 is directed to a compressed speech lexicon builder for building a compressed speech lexicon for use in a speech application. The claims have also been amended to be more particularly directed to a compressed speech lexicon. For instance, independent claim 1 has been amended to read "generating an index entry identifying a location in a compressed speech lexicon memory for holding the selected word...and writing the encoded word and its associated word-dependent data in the identified location in the speech lexicon memory." Claim 12 has been amended to include "accessing an index to obtain a word location in the compressed speech lexicon that contains information associated with the received word... and decoding the word information for use in a speech application." Claim 19 has also been amended to read "a hash table generator, coupled to the hashing component, configured to determine a next available location in a speech lexicon memory and write, at an address in a hash table identified by the hash value, the next available location in the speech lexicon memory; and a speech lexicon memory generator... configured to store in the speech lexicon memory, for use by the speech application, the compressed words and compressed word-dependent data...". It is

thus now very clear that the present invention deals with a compressed speech lexicon for use in a speech application. The references cited by the Examiner simply fail to teach or suggest such a system.

Instead, the Burrows reference discloses a method of parsing and indexing a web page. This is completely different from the present invention. The Burrows reference simply has no relation to the present invention. In particular, there are fundamental differences between a speech lexicon and other structures that have similarities to a lexicon. For example, a speech lexicon in the present context contains information related to the pronunciation and/or recognition of a spoken word. This information is clearly lacking from the Burrows reference. Further, the Burrows reference makes no mention of word-dependent data. Burrows treats items that are not words, but information, such as metawords, as separate words and these are indexed along with words. Thus, the Burrows reference does not disclose anything related to a speech lexicon, nor does it disclose word-dependent data.

Similarly, while the Sarukkai reference is directed to a computer system for user provided speech actuation and access to stored information, it simply fails to teach or suggest, or remedy in any way, the deficiencies of the Burrows reference. Sarukkai describes the basics of speech recognition and a method for dealing with out of context words. However, the Sarukkai reference relates to speech recognition and web applications, and has nothing whatsoever to do with generating a compressed speech lexicon for use in a speech application. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Sarukkai reference is also inapplicable to the present set of claims, and in any case, does not teach or suggest the limitations set out in the present claims.

The Pringle reference, as with the other two references discussed above, simply has nothing to do with a compressed speech lexicon. The Pringle reference is directed to a method and apparatus for translating a document from one language to another language. This is commonly referred to as machine translation and involves natural language processing, but not necessarily speech recognition. The Pringle reference simply does not disclose anything related to a speech application or a compressed speech lexicon. In fact, the process disclosed in Pringle would not be an acceptable process for use on a speech lexicon. Therefore, the Pringle reference simply cannot teach or suggest the present claims, either alone or in combination with any of the other references cited by the Examiner.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that the references cited by the Examiner simply fail to teach or suggest any limitations with respect to a compressed speech lexicon, and therefore the present claims are allowable over the references. In particular, Applicant submits that claims 1-19 and 22 are allowable over the references cited by the Examiner. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19 and 22 are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____

Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg